

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Fig. 14, wherein element "21" has been amended to read element "1," and element "22" has been amended to read element "2."

Attachments: One Replacement Sheet - Fig. 14

REMARKS

Applicant traverses the objections to the drawings.

Reference numeral “1” is used to refer to the exhaust heat power generation apparatus in both the specification (see, *e.g.*, page 7, line 7 of Figs. 1-4) and the drawings. Figs. 5 and 6 correctly refer to the exhaust heat power generation apparatus with reference numeral 1. Applicant has corrected a typographical error at page 19, line 34 and page 20, lines 2-7, wherein the heat power generation apparatus inadvertently was referred to with reference numeral 21, to correctly refer to the heat power generation apparatus with reference numeral 1.

Reference numeral 21 properly refers to a bolt, as disclosed at page 15, lines 20 and 27, and as correctly depicted in Figs. 5 and 6.

Reference numeral 22 in Fig. 5 correctly refers to a nut, attached to the bolt 21 (see page 15, line 20).

Reference numeral “2” correctly refers to an exhaust heat power generation unit (see page 19, line 20). This reference numeral is now correctly depicted in Fig. 14, and typographical errors related to this reference numeral have been corrected on pages 19 and 20.

Reference numerals 2A and 2D also are correctly used in Figs. 5 and 6. These elements are “units” in the overall heat exhaust power generation apparatus (see page 16, line 32).

Applicant has amended the cited informality at page 8 of the specification to state that Fig. 7B (not Fig. 7A) depicts openings 5e.

The element designated by reference numeral 20, contrary to the Examiner’s assertion, is shown in each of as-filed Figs. 4-6.

None of the above amendments are new matter, because they all were disclosed in the as-filed specification, drawings, or claims. Each of the drawing objections have been obviated, and the objections should be withdrawn.

Applicant respectfully traverses the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejection of claims 1-10. The term “rigidity” encompasses the commonly-understood definition of the term, and Applicant is not required to set forth specific values or units of measurement. Instead, Applicant has amended claims 1 and 2 to recite rigidity in terms of comparative values, between different components of the claimed exhaust heat power generation apparatus, in a format which would be understood by persons of ordinary skill in the art.

Applicant respectfully traverses the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 1-4 and 8-10 over Katsumi (JP H11-122960); and the § 103(a) rejection of claims 5-7 over Katsumi in view of Kazuhiko (JP H11-036981). As recited, e.g., in claim 1, an exhaust heat power generation apparatus comprises a thermoelectric converting unit having a first value of rigidity, a heat exchange unit having a second value of rigidity, and a cooling unit having a third value of rigidity. The third value of rigidity of the cooling unit is higher than the first and second values of rigidity of the thermoelectric converting unit and the heat exchange unit, respectively.

Katsumi neither discloses nor suggests different values of rigidity for different components, and particularly does not disclose or suggest that a value of rigidity of a cooling unit is higher than respective values of rigidity of a thermoelectric converting unit and a heat exchange unit. Katsumi only discloses at paragraph [0063] that a heat exchange unit can be manufactured from a number of metals. The Examiner

hypothesizes at page 6, lines 21, *et seq.* of the Office Action, that one of ordinary skill would desire a more rigid cooling unit in order to better attach it to a thermoelectric converting unit. Katsumi, however, discloses providing a buffer member 35 between a radiation surface 13 of an outer housing 11, and the heat exchange unit. Katsumi, therefore, teaches away from the claimed attachment. Kazuhiko also fails to disclose this feature of the claims. Kazuhiko, viewed alone, or viewed in combination with Katsumi, therefore, does not render obvious the claimed higher rigidity of the heat exchange member.

Neither Katsumi, standing alone, therefore, nor Katsumi combined with Kazuhiko, suggests all of the elements of the claims, and hence no *prima facie* case of obviousness has been established.


In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: June 17, 2008

By: 
James W. Edmondson
Reg. No. 33,871

Attachments: One (1) Replacement Sheet of Drawings (Fig. 14)